

Math 357  
Long quiz 04A

2024-02-19 (M)

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_

Let  $\mathbf{Q}$  denote the field of rational numbers; given a prime  $p \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , let  $\mathbf{F}_p \cong \mathbf{Z}/(p)$  denote the finite field with  $p$  elements; and let  $t$  be an indeterminate. For each of the quotient rings below, characterize its algebraic structure as “field”, “integral domain but not field”, or “ring but not integral domain”. Justify your characterization.

$$R_1 = \mathbf{F}_2[t]/(t^4 + t^2 + 1) \quad R_2 = \mathbf{Q}[t]/(t^3 + t^2 - t + 1) \quad R_3 = \mathbf{Q}[t]/(3t^3 + 4t^2 + 2t - 4)$$

*Hint:* If you feel inclined to do a lot of computation, then I invite you to first check with me.

**Solution:** We analyze each quotient ring in turn.

$R_1$  : Ring but not integral domain. Let  $f_1 = t^4 + t^2 + 1 \in \mathbf{F}_2[t]$ . If  $f_1$  is reducible, then it has a factor of degree 1 or degree 2. The polynomial  $f_1 \in \mathbf{F}_2[t]$  has a factor of degree 1 if and only if the function  $f_1 : \mathbf{F}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_2$  has a zero, which direct computation shows is not the case. There are only four polynomials in  $\mathbf{F}_2[t]$  with degree 2 (why?), and three of them factor into linear factors, which we checked for in the previous case. Thus it remains only to check whether

$$f_1 = (t^2 + t + 1)^2$$

which direct computation shows is a valid equation. Thus  $f_1 \in \mathbf{F}_2[t]$  is reducible, so  $\mathbf{F}_2[t]/(f_1)$  is a ring but not an integral domain.

$R_2$  : Field. Let  $f_2 = t^3 + t^2 - t + 1 \in \mathbf{Z}[t]$ . If we apply the reduction homomorphism corresponding to the ideal  $(3) \triangleleft \mathbf{Z}$  to  $f_2$ , then we get the polynomial  $\bar{f}_2 \in \mathbf{F}_3[t]$ , which we may express with the same coefficients as  $f_2$  (viewed in  $\mathbf{F}_3$ , rather than in  $\mathbf{Z}$  or  $\mathbf{Q}$ ). Because  $\deg \bar{f}_2 = 3$ , the polynomial  $\bar{f}_2 \in \mathbf{F}_3[t]$  is reducible if and only if the function  $\bar{f}_2 : \mathbf{F}_3 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_3$  has a zero. Direct computation shows that for all  $\alpha \in \mathbf{F}_3$ ,  $\bar{f}_2(\alpha) \neq 0$ , so  $\bar{f}_2$  is irreducible. Because  $f_2$  is nonconstant and monic, and  $(3) \triangleleft \mathbf{Z}$  is proper, this implies that  $f_2 \in \mathbf{Z}[t]$  is irreducible. Thus Gauß’s lemma implies that  $f_2 \in \mathbf{Q}[t]$  is irreducible. Hence  $\mathbf{Q}[t]/(f_2)$  is a field.

Note that we cannot apply the Eisenstein–Schönemann criterion directly to  $f_2$  (why not?), nor may we (correctly) argue that  $f_2$  must have a zero because  $\deg f_2$  is odd (why not?).

$R_3$  : Ring but not integral domain. Let  $f_3 = 3t^3 + 4t^2 + 2t - 4 \in \mathbf{Z}[t]$ . Because  $\deg f_3 = 3$ , the polynomial  $f_3 \in \mathbf{Q}[t]$  is reducible if and only if the function  $f_3 : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  has a zero. If  $\frac{a}{b} \in \mathbf{Q}$  is a zero of  $f_3$ , and if  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ , then we have seen that, in  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $a \mid -4$  (the constant term of  $f_3$ ) and  $b \mid 3$  (the leading coefficient of  $f_3$ ). We have finitely many possibilities for  $\frac{a}{b}$ —24 in this case (why?)—but we may reduce our work significantly if we view  $f_3 \in \mathbf{R}[t]$  and note that

$$f_3(0) = -4 < 0$$

$$f_3(1) = 5 > 0$$

Because the function induced by a polynomial is continuous, the intermediate value theorem implies that  $f_3$  has a zero (in  $\mathbf{R}$ ) on the interval  $(0, 1)$ . The only values of  $\frac{a}{b}$  in this interval, and consistent with the divisibility requirements on  $a$  and  $b$ , are  $\frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$ . Checking these possibilities, we find  $f_3(\frac{2}{3}) = 0$ . Hence  $f_3$  is reducible in  $\mathbf{Q}[t]$ , so  $\mathbf{Q}[t]/(f_3)$  is a ring but not an integral domain.

Note that we cannot apply the Eisenstein–Schönemann criterion directly to  $f_3$  (why not?).